REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application. Claims 46-67

are pending. Claims 46, 49, 50, 54, and 61 have been amended. Claims 48 and 67 have

been cancelled. No claims have added. Therefore, claims 46 and 48-66 are now

presented for examination.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the Examiner's careful consideration of the

application and the finding of allowable subject matter. Claims 55-60 were found to be

allowable. The Examiner indicated that Claims 61-66 would be allowable if rewritten or

amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claims

48, 49 and 54 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would

be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base

claim and any intervening claims.

The claims have been amended as follows:

Claim 46 has been amended to incorporate the allowable subject matter of claim

48. The claims dependent on claim 46 have been previously presented and are allowable

as being dependent on the allowable base claim. Of such claims, claims 49 and 54 were

specifically found to be allowable if presented in independent form. Such claims were

previously dependent on claim 48, but have been amended to be dependent on claim 46,

which now includes the subject matter of claim 48.

Claims 55-60 are presented without any changes.

Claim 61 has been amended as discussed below. Claims 62-66 are presented

without any change.

Docket No.: 42P10725

Application No.: 09/752,550

-8-

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 52 and 61-66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as

being indefinite for failing to point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which

applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 52 was found to have insufficient antecedent basis for the phrases "the first

drain bias circuit" and "the second drain bias circuit". The incorporation of the allowable

subject matter of claim 48 into claim 46 has addressed this issue, and it is submitted that,

as the claims are amended, there is now sufficient antecedent basis for the provisions of

claim 52.

Claims 55-60 are presented without any changes.

Claim 61 has been amended to change the phrase "reference input node" to

"sense input node" in line 17 of the claim. Further, the article "a" has been added before

"reference input node" in line 19. For clarification, the phrase "for the reference cell" has

been added in line 19-20. Claims 62-66 are dependent on claim 61 and are therefore

allowable because they are dependent on the allowable base claim.

It is submitted that amendments presented herein fully address the rejections, and

that the claims, as amended, are allowable under 35 U.S.C. 112.

35 U.S.C. §102 Rejection,

Miyamoto et al.

The Examiner has rejected claims 46-47, 50-53 and 67 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

as being anticipated over U.S. Patent No. 4,694,427 of Miyamoto et al. (hereinafter

"Miyamoto").

Docket No.: 42P10725

Application No.: 09/752,550

-9-

Without any concession regarding the rejection, Claim 46 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter found to be allowable in claim 48. Claims 47 and 50-53 thus are allowable because they are based on the allowable base claim. Claim 67 has been cancelled without prejudice.

It is submitted that amendments presented herein fully address the rejections, and that the claims, as amended, are not anticipated by Miyamoto.

## Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections have been overcome by the amendment and remark, and that the claims as amended are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the rejections be withdrawn and the claims as amended be allowed.

Docket No.: 42P10725 Application No.: 09/752,550

## Invitation for a Telephone Interview

The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (303) 740-1980 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

## Request for an Extension of Time

The Applicant respectfully petitions for an extension of time to respond to the outstanding Office Action pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) should one be necessary. Please charge our Deposit Account No. 09-0457 to cover the necessary fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17 for such an extension.

## Charge our Deposit Account

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 09-0457

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 7/21/03

Mark C. Van Ness

Reg. No. 39,865

12400 Wilshire Boulevard 7<sup>th</sup> Floor Los Angeles, California 90025-1026 (303) 740-1980

Docket No.: 42P10725 Application No.: 09/752,550